

REMARKS

The Applicants do not believe that examination of the foregoing amendment will result in the introduction of new matter into the present application for invention. Therefore, the Applicants, respectfully, request that this amendment be entered and that the claims to the present application, kindly, be reconsidered.

The Office Action dated August 17, 2005 has been received and considered by the Applicants. Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application for invention. Claims 1-12 are rejected to by the August 17, 2005 Office Action.

The Office Action suggests that section headings be added to the specification. The Applicant, respectfully, points out that 37CFR 1.77(b) provides a suggestion for specification headings; however, there is no requirement that the specification contain headings. It is only required that the information appear in the order as stated by 37 CFR 1.77(b). Therefore, the Application respectfully declines to add specification headings.

The disclosure is objected to because the Abstract contains more than one paragraph. The foregoing amendment to the specification has corrected this oversight.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 8-10 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,849,956 issued in the name of Aizawa (hereinafter referred to as Aizawa). The foregoing amendment to the claims has modified independent Claim 1 and 8 to define subject matter for the auxiliary buffer to have faster access times than the buffer. This subject matter is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, the foregoing amendment to the claims is believed to have rendered this rejection moot.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known within the art to divide information into data packets. Rejected Claim 1 defines that the information file to be recorded is divided into data packets, recording a data packet in a block of the recording medium and storing the said data packet in an auxiliary memory in an auxiliary writing session if the block appears to be a defective block. The Applicant, respectfully, submits that it is not well known to implement data packets in the foregoing manner. The Applicant, respectfully, requests that the Examiner produce prior art references clearly showing that it is well known to divide information into data packets and use the data packets in a manner as defined by rejected Claim 1.


The foregoing amendment to the claims adds new claims 13-18 that are of similar scope

to Claims 1-12. Therefore, examination of new claims 13-18 will not introduce new matter into the present application for invention.

Applicant is not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.99.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, with such allowance being, respectfully, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James D. Leimbach
Patent Attorney Reg. No. 34,374

Please address all correspondence for this application to:
Michael E. Belk, Senior Intellectual Property Counsel
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
Philips Electronics N.A. Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001 USA
(914) 333-9643,

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being transmitted on this date via
facsimile transmission to (571) 273-8300 AND addressed to:
Mail Stop: Amendment
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Transmission: November 17, 2005

(Signature)

By:


James D. Leimbach